

Equilibrium problems for infinite dimensional vector potentials with external fields

Natalia Zorii

Abstract

The study deals with a minimal energy problem in the presence of an external field $\mathbf{f} = (f_i)_{i \in I}$ over noncompact classes of vector measures $\mu = (\mu^i)_{i \in I}$ of infinite dimension in a locally compact space. The components μ^i are positive measures (charges) normalized by $\int g_i d\mu^i = a_i$ (where a_i and g_i are given) and supported by given closed sets A_i with the sign $+1$ or -1 prescribed such that $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ whenever $\text{sign } A_i \neq \text{sign } A_j$, and the law of interaction of μ^i , $i \in I$, is determined by the interaction matrix $(\text{sign } A_i \text{sign } A_j)_{i,j \in I}$. For all positive definite kernels satisfying Fuglede's condition of consistency between the vague (= weak*) and strong topologies, sufficient conditions for the existence of equilibrium measures are established and properties of their uniqueness, vague compactness, and continuity under exhaustion of A_i by compact K_i are studied. We also obtain variational inequalities for the $\mathbf{f}$ -weighted equilibrium potentials, single out their characteristic properties, and analyze continuity of the equilibrium constants.

Subject classification: 31C15.

Key words: vector potentials of infinite dimensions, minimal energy problems for vector measures with external fields, completeness theorem for vector measures.

1 Introduction

The interest to minimal energy problems in the presence of an external field, initially inspired by C. F. Gauss [13] and further experiencing a new growth due to work of O. Frostman [10] and Polish and Japanese mathematicians (F. Leja, J. Górski, W. Kleiner, J. Siciak and S. Kametani, M. Ohtsuka, N. Ninomiya; see [20, 24] and the references cited therein), has been motivated by their direct relations with the Dirichlet and balayage problems.

A new impulse to this part of potential theory (which is often referred to as the Gauss variational problem) came in the 1980's when A. A. Gonchar and E. A. Rakhmanov [14, 15], H. N. Mhaskar and E. B. Saff [21] efficiently applied logarithmic potentials with external fields in the investigation of orthogonal polynomials and rational approximations to analytic functions; for references to subsequent publications, see the books [23, 25].

We shall consider the Gauss variational problem in a rather general setting, over classes of vector measures of infinite dimension in a locally compact Hausdorff space X . In case the measures are of finite dimension, the vector setting of the problem goes back to [24, § 2.9]; see also [14, 16], related to the logarithmic kernel in the plane. To formulate the problem and shortly outline the results obtained, we start by introducing briefly relevant notions.

Let $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}(X)$ denote the linear space of all real-valued scalar Radon measures ν on X equipped with the *vague* (= *weak**) topology, i.e., the topology of pointwise convergence on the class $C_0(X)$ of all real-valued continuous functions φ on X with compact support. A *kernel* κ on X is meant to be an element from $\Phi(X \times X)$, where $\Phi(Y)$ consist of all lower semicontinuous functions $\psi : Y \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ such that $\psi \geq 0$ unless Y is compact.

Given $\nu, \nu_1 \in \mathfrak{M}$, the *mutual energy* and the *potential* with respect to a kernel κ are defined respectively by

$$\kappa(\nu, \nu_1) := \int \kappa(x, y) d(\nu \otimes \nu_1)(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa(\cdot, \nu) := \int \kappa(\cdot, y) d\nu(y).$$

(Here and in the sequel, when introducing notation, we shall always tacitly assume the corresponding object on the right to be well defined.) For $\nu = \nu_1$ the mutual energy $\kappa(\nu, \nu_1)$ gives the *energy* of ν . The set of all $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}$ with $-\infty < \kappa(\nu, \nu) < \infty$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_\kappa$.

We shall be mainly concerned with a *positive definite* kernel κ , which means that it is symmetric (i. e., $\kappa(x, y) = \kappa(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in X$) and the energy $\kappa(\nu, \nu)$, $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}$, is nonnegative whenever defined. Then $\mathcal{E}$ forms a pre-Hilbert space with the scalar product $\kappa(\nu, \nu_1)$ and the seminorm $\|\nu\|_\mathcal{E} := \sqrt{\kappa(\nu, \nu)}$ (see [11]). A positive definite kernel κ is called *strictly positive definite* if the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_\mathcal{E}$ is a norm.

Given a closed set $E \subset X$, let $\mathfrak{M}^+(E)$ consist of all nonnegative measures $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}$ supported by E , and let $\mathcal{E}^+(E) := \mathfrak{M}^+(E) \cap \mathcal{E}$. Also write $\mathfrak{M}^+ := \mathfrak{M}^+(X)$ and $\mathcal{E}^+ := \mathcal{E}^+(X)$.

We consider a countable, locally finite collection $\mathbf{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ of fixed closed sets $A_i \subset X$ with the sign $+1$ or -1 prescribed such that the oppositely signed sets are mutually disjoint. Let $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ stand for the Cartesian product $\prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{M}^+(A_i)$; then an element μ of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ is a vector measure $(\mu^i)_{i \in I}$ with the components $\mu^i \in \mathfrak{M}^+(A_i)$. If, moreover, $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in I}$ is a vector-valued function, we shall write $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mu \rangle := \sum_{i \in I} \int u_i d\mu^i$.

Let a kernel κ be fixed. Corresponding to an electrostatic interpretation, we assume that the interaction of point charges lying on the conductors A_i , $i \in I$, is characterized by the interaction matrix $(\alpha_i \alpha_j)_{i, j \in I}$, where $\alpha_i := \text{sign } A_i$. Given vector measures $\mu, \mu_1 \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$, we define the *mutual energy*

$$\kappa(\mu, \mu_1) := \sum_{i, j \in I} \alpha_i \alpha_j \kappa(\mu^i, \mu_1^j) \quad (1.1)$$

and the *vector potential* $\kappa_\mu(x)$, $x \in X$, as a vector-valued function with the components

$$\kappa_\mu^i(x) := \sum_{j \in I} \alpha_i \alpha_j \kappa(x, \mu^j), \quad i \in I. \quad (1.2)$$

For $\mu = \mu_1$ the mutual energy $\kappa(\mu, \mu_1)$ defines the *energy* of μ . Let $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ consist of all $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ whose energy $\kappa(\mu, \mu)$ is finite.

Fix also a vector-valued function $\mathbf{f} = (f_i)_{i \in I}$ to be treated as an external field. The *f-weighted vector potential* and the *f-weighted energy* of $\mu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ are then defined by

$$\mathbf{W}_\mu := \kappa_\mu + \mathbf{f}, \quad (1.3)$$

$$G_\mathbf{f}(\mu) := \kappa(\mu, \mu) + 2\langle \mathbf{f}, \mu \rangle, \quad (1.4)$$

respectively. In the present study we shall be mainly focused with the case where either $f_i \in \Phi(X)$ for all $i \in I$, or $f_i = \alpha_i \kappa(\cdot, \sigma)$, $i \in I$ (here $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$ is given).

We also fix a numerical vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i \in I}$ with $a_i > 0$ for all $i \in I$ and a vector-valued function $\mathbf{g} = (g_i)_{i \in I}$, where $g_i : A_i \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ are continuous. We shall be interested in the problem of minimizing $G_\mathbf{f}(\mu)$ over the class of all $\mu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ with $\langle g_i, \mu^i \rangle = a_i$, $i \in I$.

The main question is whether equilibrium measures $\lambda_\mathbf{A}$ in the minimal *f*-weighted energy problem exist. If $\mathbf{A}$ is finite, A_i is compact and $f_i \in \Phi(X)$ for every $i \in I$, while $\kappa(x, y)$ is continuous on $A_i \times A_j$ whenever $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j$, then the existence of those $\lambda_\mathbf{A}$ can easily be established by exploiting the vague topology only (see [24]; cf. also [14, 16, 23, 25]). However, the question becomes rather nontrivial if any of these four assumptions is dropped.

To solve the problem on the existence of equilibrium measures $\lambda_\mathbf{A}$ in the general case where $\mathbf{A}$ is infinite and (or) A_i , $i \in I$, are noncompact, we restrict ourselves to positive definite kernels κ and work out an approach based on the following arguments.

The set $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ is shown to be a semimetric space with the semimetric (see Sect. 3.4)

$$\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_{\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})} := \left[\sum_{i,j \in I} \alpha_i \alpha_j \kappa(\mu_1^i - \mu_2^i, \mu_1^j - \mu_2^j) \right]^{1/2}, \quad (1.5)$$

and one can define an inclusion R of $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ into the pre-Hilbert space $\mathcal{E}$ such that $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ is isometric to its R -image, the latter being regarded as a semimetric subspace of $\mathcal{E}$.

Another crucial fact is that, for rather general κ , $\mathbf{g}$, and $\mathbf{a}$, the topological subspace of $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ consisting of all μ with $\langle g_i, \mu^i \rangle \leq a_i$, $i \in I$, turns out to be complete (see Theorem 9.1).

Using these arguments, we obtain sufficient conditions for the existence of equilibrium measures $\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}$ and establish statements on their uniqueness and vague compactness (see Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 8.1). Continuity properties of equilibrium measures under exhaustion of $\mathbf{A}$ by $\mathbf{K}$ with compact K_i , $i \in I$, are analyzed as well (see Theorem 8.2).

We also establish variational inequalities for the $\mathbf{f}$ -weighted equilibrium potentials $\mathbf{W}_{\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}}$ (see Theorems 7.1 and 7.2); some of those inequalities are shown to be characteristic (see Theorem 7.3). In particular, there exist numbers $C_{\mathbf{A}}^i$, $i \in I$, called the *$\mathbf{f}$ -weighted equilibrium constants*, such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_i W_{\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}}^i(x) &\geq C_{\mathbf{A}}^i g(x) \quad \text{n. e. in } A_i, \\ G_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}) &\leq \sum_{i \in I} C_{\mathbf{A}}^i + \langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where *n. e. (nearly everywhere)* means that the set of all $x \in A_i$ for which the inequality fails to hold has interior capacity zero; and these inequalities determine uniquely equilibrium measures among all the admissible ones. Under proper additional restrictions, it is also true that

$$a_i W_{\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}}^i(x) \leq C_{\mathbf{A}}^i g(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in S(\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}^i).$$

The equilibrium constants are uniquely determined and can be written in either of the forms

$$C_{\mathbf{A}}^i = \langle W_{\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}}^i, \lambda_{\mathbf{A}}^i \rangle = \inf_{x \in A_i} \frac{a_i W_{\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}}^i(x)}{g(x)},$$

the infimum being taken over all A_i excepting probably its subset of interior capacity zero. Furthermore, for rather general κ , $\mathbf{g}$, $\mathbf{a}$, and $\mathbf{f}$, these constants are shown to be continuous under exhaustion of $\mathbf{A}$ by $\mathbf{K}$ with compact K_i , $i \in I$ (see Theorem 8.2).

The results obtained and the approach applied develop and generalize the corresponding ones from the author's articles [27, 28, 29, 30], related to vector measures of finite dimensions.

2 Preliminaries: topologies, consistent and perfect kernels

In all that follows, we shall always suppose the kernel κ to be positive definite. In addition to the *strong* topology on $\mathcal{E}$, determined by the seminorm $\|\nu\| := \|\nu\|_{\mathcal{E}}$, it is often useful to consider the *weak* topology on $\mathcal{E}$, defined by means of the seminorms $\nu \mapsto |\kappa(\nu, \mu)|$, $\mu \in \mathcal{E}$ (see [11]). The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$|\kappa(\nu, \mu)| \leq \|\nu\| \|\mu\|, \quad \text{where } \nu, \mu \in \mathcal{E},$$

implies immediately that the strong topology on $\mathcal{E}$ is finer than the weak one.

In [11, 12], B. Fuglede introduced the following two *equivalent* properties of consistency between the induced strong, weak, and vague topologies on $\mathcal{E}^+$:

- (C₁) Every strong Cauchy net in $\mathcal{E}^+$ converges strongly to every its vague cluster point;
- (C₂) Every strongly bounded and vaguely convergent net in $\mathcal{E}^+$ converges weakly to the vague limit.

Definition 2.1 Following Fuglede [11], we call a kernel κ *consistent* if it satisfies either of the properties (C₁) and (C₂), and *perfect* if, in addition, it is strictly positive definite.

Remark 2.1 One has to consider *nets* or *filters* in $\mathfrak{M}^+$ instead of sequences, since the vague topology in general does not satisfy the first axiom of countability. We follow Moore's and Smith's theory of convergence, based on the concept of nets (see [22]; cf. also [9, Chap. 0] and [18, Chap. 2]). However, if X is metrizable and countable at infinity, then $\mathfrak{M}^+$ satisfies the first axiom of countability (see [11, Lemma 1.2.1]) and the use of nets may be avoided.

Theorem 2.1 (Fuglede [11]) *A kernel κ is perfect if and only if $\mathcal{E}^+$ is strongly complete and the strong topology on $\mathcal{E}^+$ is finer than the vague one.*

Remark 2.2 In $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, the Newtonian kernel $|x - y|^{2-n}$ is perfect [4]. So are the Riesz kernel $|x - y|^{\alpha-n}$, $0 < \alpha < n$, in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$ [5, 6], and the restriction of the kernel $-\log |x - y|$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ to an open unit ball [19]. Furthermore, if D is an open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, and its generalized Green function g_D exists (see, e. g., [17, Th. 5.24]), then g_D is perfect as well [8].

Remark 2.3 As is seen from the above definitions and Theorem 2.1, the concept of consistent or perfect kernels is an efficient tool in minimal energy problems over classes of *nonnegative scalar* Radon measures with finite energy. Indeed, the theory of capacities of *sets* has been developed in [11] exactly for those kernels. We shall show below that this concept is efficient, as well, in minimal energy problems over classes of *vector measures* of finite or infinite dimensions. This is guaranteed by a theorem on the completeness of proper subspaces of the semimetric space $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$, to be stated in Sect. 9.2.

3 Condensers. Vector measures; their energies and potentials

3.1 Condensers of countably many plates. Associated vector measures

Let I^+ and I^- be countable (finite or infinite) disjoint sets of indices $i \in \mathbb{N}$, where the latter is allowed to be empty, and let I denote their union. Assume that to every $i \in I$ there corresponds a nonempty, closed set $A_i \subset X$.

Definition 3.1 A collection $\mathbf{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ is called an (I^+, I^-) -*condenser* (or simply a *condenser*) in X if every compact subset of X intersects with at most finitely many A_i and

$$A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset \quad \text{for all } i \in I^+, j \in I^-. \quad (3.1)$$

The sets A_i , $i \in I^+$, and A_j , $j \in I^-$, are called the *positive* and, respectively, *negative plates* of the condenser $\mathbf{A}$. Note that any two equally signed plates can intersect each other.

Given I^+ and I^- , let $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}(I^+, I^-)$ be the class of all (I^+, I^-) -condensers in X . A condenser $\mathbf{A} \in \mathfrak{C}$ will be called *compact* if so are all A_i , $i \in I$, and *finite* if I is finite.

In the sequel, also the following notation will be used:

$$A^+ := \bigcup_{i \in I^+} A_i, \quad A^- := \bigcup_{i \in I^-} A_i.$$

Observe that A^+ and A^- might both be noncompact even for a compact $\mathbf{A}$.

Given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathfrak{C}$, let $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ consist of all *vector measures* $\mu = (\mu^i)_{i \in I}$, where $\mu^i \in \mathfrak{M}^+(A_i)$ for all $i \in I$; that is, $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ stands for the Cartesian product $\prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{M}^+(A_i)$. The product topology on $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$, where every $\mathfrak{M}^+(A_i)$ is equipped with the vague topology, will be called the *$\mathbf{A}$ -vague topology*. Since $\mathfrak{M}(X)$ is Hausdorff, so is $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ (cf. [18, Chap. 3, Th. 5]).

A set $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ is called *$\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely bounded* if, for all $\varphi \in C_0(X)$ and $i \in I$,

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{F}} |\mu^i(\varphi)| < \infty.$$

Lemma 3.1 *If $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ is $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely bounded, then it is $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely relatively compact.*

Proof. Since by [2, Chap. III, § 2, Prop. 9] any vaguely bounded part of $\mathfrak{M}$ is vaguely relatively compact, the lemma follows immediately from Tychonoff's theorem on the product of compact spaces (see, e.g., [18, Chap. 5, Th. 13]). $\square$

3.2 Mapping $R : \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$. Relation of R -equivalency on $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$

Since each compact subset of X intersects with at most finitely many A_i , for every $\varphi \in C_0(X)$ only a finite number of $\mu^i(\varphi)$ (where $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ is given) are nonzero. This yields that to every vector measure $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ there corresponds a unique scalar Radon measure $R\mu \in \mathfrak{M}$ such that

$$R\mu(\varphi) = \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i \mu^i(\varphi) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in C_0(X);$$

because of (3.1), positive and negative parts in Jordan's decomposition of $R\mu$ can respectively be written in the form

$$R\mu^+ = \sum_{i \in I^+} \mu^i, \quad R\mu^- = \sum_{i \in I^-} \mu^i.$$

Of course, the inclusion $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ thus defined is in general non-injective, i.e., one may choose $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ so that $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, while $R\mu_1 = R\mu_2$. We shall call $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ *R -equivalent* if $R\mu_1 = R\mu_2$ — or, which is equivalent, whenever $\sum_{i \in I} \mu_1^i = \sum_{i \in I} \mu_2^i$.

Observe that the relation of R -equivalency implies that of identity (and, hence, these two relations on $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ are actually equivalent) if and only if all $A_i, i \in I$, are mutually disjoint.

Lemma 3.2 *The $\mathbf{A}$ -vague convergence of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \subset \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ to $\mu_0 \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ implies the vague convergence of $(R\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ to $R\mu_0$.*

Proof. This is obvious in view of the fact that the support of any $\varphi \in C_0(X)$ might have points in common with only finitely many A_i . $\square$

Remark 3.1 Lemma 3.2 in general can not be inverted. However, if all $A_i, i \in I$, are mutually disjoint, then the vague convergence of $(R\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ to $R\mu_0$ implies the $\mathbf{A}$ -vague convergence of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ to μ_0 . This can be seen by using the Tietze-Urysohn extension theorem.

3.3 Energies and potentials of vector measures and their R -images

In accordance with an electrostatic interpretation of a condenser $\mathbf{A}$, we suppose that the law of interaction of charges lying on its plates A_i , $i \in I$, is determined by the interaction matrix $(\alpha_i \alpha_j)_{i,j \in I}$, where

$$\alpha_i := \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } i \in I^+, \\ -1 & \text{if } i \in I^-. \end{cases}$$

Given vector measures $\mu, \mu_1 \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$, we define the *mutual energy* $\kappa(\mu, \mu_1)$ and the *vector potential* $\kappa_\mu = (\kappa_\mu^i)_{i \in I}$ by (1.1) and (1.2), respectively. If $\mu = \mu_1$, then $\kappa(\mu, \mu_1)$ defines the *energy* $\kappa(\mu, \mu)$ of μ .

Lemma 3.3 *For $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ to be of finite energy, it is necessary and sufficient that $\mu^i \in \mathcal{E}$ for all $i \in I$ and*

$$\sum_{i \in I} \|\mu^i\|^2 < \infty.$$

Proof. This follows immediately from the definition of $\kappa(\mu, \mu)$ in view of the inequality $2\kappa(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq \|\nu_1\|^2 + \|\nu_2\|^2$ for $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{E}$. $\square$

To establish relations between energies and potentials of vector measures $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ and those of their (scalar) R -images $R\mu \in \mathfrak{M}$, we start with the following two lemmas, the first one being well known (see, e. g., [11]).

Lemma 3.4 *If Y is a locally compact Hausdorff space and $\psi \in \Phi(Y)$ is given, then the map $\nu \mapsto \langle \psi, \nu \rangle$ is vaguely lower semicontinuous on $\mathfrak{M}^+(Y)$.*

Lemma 3.5 *Fix $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\psi \in \Phi(X)$. If $\langle \psi, R\mu \rangle$ is well defined, then*

$$\langle \psi, R\mu \rangle = \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i \langle \psi, \mu^i \rangle, \quad (3.2)$$

and $\langle \psi, R\mu \rangle$ is finite if and only if the series on the right converges absolutely.

Proof. We can assume ψ to be nonnegative, for if not, we replace ψ by a function $\psi' \geq 0$ obtained by adding to ψ a suitable constant $c > 0$, which is always possible since a lower semicontinuous function is bounded from below on a compact space. Hence,

$$\langle \psi, R\mu^+ \rangle \geq \sum_{i \in I^+, i \leq N} \langle \psi, \mu^i \rangle \quad \text{for all } N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

On the other hand, the sum of μ^i over all $i \in I^+$ that do not exceed N approaches $R\mu^+$ vaguely as $N \rightarrow \infty$; consequently, by Lemma 3.4,

$$\langle \psi, R\mu^+ \rangle \leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in I^+, i \leq N} \langle \psi, \mu^i \rangle.$$

Combining the last two inequalities and then letting $N \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$\langle \psi, R\mu^+ \rangle = \sum_{i \in I^+} \langle \psi, \mu^i \rangle.$$

Since the same holds true for $R\mu^-$ and I^- instead of $R\mu^+$ and I^+ , the lemma follows. $\square$

Corollary 3.1 Fix $\mu, \mu_1 \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ and $x \in \mathbf{X}$. Then

$$\kappa(R\mu, R\mu_1) = \sum_{i,j \in I} \alpha_i \alpha_j \kappa(\mu^i, \mu_1^j), \quad (3.3)$$

$$\kappa(x, R\mu) = \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i \kappa(x, \mu^i), \quad (3.4)$$

each of the identities being understood in the sense that either of its sides is well defined whenever so is the other one and then they coincide. Furthermore, the left-hand side in (3.3) or in (3.4) is finite if and only if the corresponding series on the right converges absolutely.

Proof. Relation (3.4) is a direct consequence of (3.2), while (3.3) follows from Fubini's theorem (cf. [3, § 8, Th. 1]) and Lemma 3.5 on account of the fact that $\kappa(x, \nu)$, where $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}^+$ is given, is lower semicontinuous on $\mathbf{X}$ (see, e. g., [11]). $\square$

When comparing (1.1) and (1.2) with (3.3) and (3.4), respectively, we obtain

Corollary 3.2 Given $\mu, \mu_1 \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$, $x \in \mathbf{X}$, and $i \in I$,

$$\kappa(\mu, \mu_1) = \kappa(R\mu, R\mu_1), \quad (3.5)$$

$$\kappa_\mu^i(x) = \alpha_i \kappa(x, R\mu). \quad (3.6)$$

3.4 Semimetric space of vector measures of finite energy

Let $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ consist of all $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ with finite energy $\kappa(\mu, \mu)$. Since $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$ is a convex cone, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that so is $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$.

Lemma 3.6 The cone $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ forms a semimetric space with the semimetric $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})}$ defined by (1.5). This semimetric is a metric if and only if the kernel κ is strictly positive definite while all A_i , $i \in I$, are mutually disjoint.

Proof. Fix $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$. Applying Corollary 3.1 to $\kappa(R\mu_k, R\mu_\ell)$, $k, \ell = 1, 2$, we get

$$\|R\mu_1 - R\mu_2\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 = \sum_{i,j \in I} \alpha_i \alpha_j \kappa(\mu_1^i - \mu_2^i, \mu_1^j - \mu_2^j).$$

When compared with (1.5), this yields

$$\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_{\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})}^2 = \|R\mu_1 - R\mu_2\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2. \quad (3.7)$$

Since $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}}$ is a seminorm on $\mathcal{E}$, the proof is complete. $\square$

In all that follows, $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ will always be treated as a semimetric space with the semimetric $\|\cdot\| := \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})}$. Then, by (3.7), $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ and its R -image become isometric. Similarly with the terminology in $\mathcal{E}$, the topology on $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ will be called *strong*.

Two elements of $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$, μ_1 and μ_2 , are said to be *equivalent in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$* if $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| = 0$. Observe that the equivalence in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ implies R -equivalence (i. e., then $R\mu_1 = R\mu_2$) provided the kernel κ is strictly positive definite, and it implies the identity (i. e., then $\mu_1 = \mu_2$) if, moreover, all A_i , $i \in I$, are mutually disjoint.

A vector-valued proposition $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in I}$ involving a variable point $x \in \mathbf{X}$ is said to subsist *nearly everywhere* (n. e.) in E , where E is a given subset of $\mathbf{X}$, if for every $i \in I$ the set of all $x \in E$ for which u_i fails to hold is of interior capacity zero.

Corollary 3.3 For every $\mu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$, $\kappa_\mu(x)$ is defined and finite nearly everywhere in X .

Proof. This is seen from (3.5) and (3.6) in view of the fact that the potential $\kappa(x, \nu)$ of any $\nu \in \mathcal{E}$ is defined and finite n. e. in X (see [11]). $\square$

Corollary 3.4 If μ_1 and μ_2 are equivalent in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$, then

$$\kappa_{\mu_1}(x) = \kappa_{\mu_2}(x) \quad \text{n. e. in } X.$$

Proof. Indeed, then $R\mu_1$ and $R\mu_2$ are equivalent in $\mathcal{E}$ by (3.7). Hence, $\kappa(x, R\mu_1) = \kappa(x, R\mu_2)$ nearly everywhere in X (see [11]), which together with (3.6) proves the corollary. $\square$

4 Minimal $\mathbf{f}$ -weighted energy problem

From now on the external field $\mathbf{f} = (f_i)_{i \in I}$ will always be of the following structure. For every $i \in I$, there are $f_{i1}, f_{i2} \in \Phi(X)$ such that $f_{i2} \neq \infty$ n. e. in X and

$$f_i(x) = f_{i1}(x) - f_{i2}(x), \quad x \in X,$$

where the value on the left is defined if and only if so is that on the right and then they coincide. Such an f_i is defined and $\neq -\infty$ n. e. in X and is universally measurable, i. e., measurable with respect to every $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}$. Also note that, for any $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A})$, $\langle \mathbf{f}, \mu \rangle$ is finite if and only if $\sum_{i \in I} \langle f_i, \mu^i \rangle$ converges absolutely.

Given $\mu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$, we then define the $\mathbf{f}$ -weighted vector potential $\mathbf{W}_\mu$ and the $\mathbf{f}$ -weighted energy $G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mu)$ by (1.3) and (1.4), respectively. Note that, according to Corollary 3.3, $\mathbf{W}_\mu$ is defined and $\neq -\infty$ n. e. in X . Also observe that, by (3.5), (3.6), and Fubini's theorem,

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mu) = \langle \mathbf{W}_\mu + \mathbf{f}, \mu \rangle.$$

Having fixed also a vector-valued function $\mathbf{g} = (g_i)_{i \in I}$, where $g_i : A_i \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, $i \in I$, are continuous, and a numerical vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i \in I}$ with $a_i > 0$, we write

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) := \{ \mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}) : \langle g_i, \mu^i \rangle = a_i \text{ for all } i \in I \},$$

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) := \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \cap \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}),$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) := \{ \mu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) : \langle \mathbf{f}, \mu \rangle \text{ is finite} \}$$

and further introduce the extremal value

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) := \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})} G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mu). \quad (4.1)$$

In (4.1), as usual, the infimum over the empty set is taken to be $+\infty$.

Problem 4.1 If $-\infty < G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) < \infty$, does there exist $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ with

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda) = G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})?$$

This minimal $\mathbf{f}$ -weighted energy problem will be referred to as the *Gauss variational problem*. Cf. [7, 14, 16, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30]. Along with its electrostatic interpretation, it has found various important applications to approximation theory and to potential theory itself.

A minimizer λ is called an *equilibrium measure* corresponding to the data $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{g}$, and $\mathbf{f}$. The problem is said to be *solvable* if the class $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ of all those λ is nonempty.

5 On uniqueness of equilibrium measures

Lemma 5.1 *If λ and $\hat{\lambda}$ both belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, then¹*

$$\|\lambda - \hat{\lambda}\|_{\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})} = 0, \quad (5.1)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda \rangle = \langle \mathbf{f}, \hat{\lambda} \rangle, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_{\lambda}(x) = \mathbf{W}_{\hat{\lambda}}(x) \quad \text{n. e. in } X. \quad (5.3)$$

Proof. Since the class $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is convex, we conclude from (4.1), (1.4), and (3.5) that

$$4G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \leq 4G_{\mathbf{f}}\left(\frac{\lambda + \hat{\lambda}}{2}\right) = \|R\lambda + R\hat{\lambda}\|^2 + 4\langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda + \hat{\lambda} \rangle.$$

On the other hand, applying the parallelogram identity in the pre-Hilbert space $\mathcal{E}$ to $R\lambda$ and $R\hat{\lambda}$ and then adding and subtracting $4\langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda + \hat{\lambda} \rangle$, we get

$$\|R\lambda - R\hat{\lambda}\|^2 = -\|R\lambda + R\hat{\lambda}\|^2 - 4\langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda + \hat{\lambda} \rangle + 2G_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda) + 2G_{\mathbf{f}}(\hat{\lambda}).$$

When combined with the preceding relation, this yields

$$0 \leq \|R\lambda - R\hat{\lambda}\|^2 \leq -4G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) + 2G_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda) + 2G_{\mathbf{f}}(\hat{\lambda}) = 0,$$

which establishes (5.1) because of (3.7). In turn, (5.1) implies that $\|\lambda\|^2 = \|\hat{\lambda}\|^2$, whose subtraction from $G_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda) = G_{\mathbf{f}}(\hat{\lambda})$ results in (5.2). Due to Corollary 3.4, it can also be concluded from (5.1) that $\kappa_{\lambda}(x) = \kappa_{\hat{\lambda}}(x)$ n. e. in X , which together with (1.3) gives (5.3). $\square$

Thus, any two equilibrium measures (if exist) are equivalent in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$. Consequently, they are R -equivalent if the kernel κ is strictly positive definite, and they are equal if, moreover, all A_i , $i \in I$, are mutually disjoint.

6 Elementary properties of $G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$

6.1 Monotonicity and continuity of $G_{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$

On $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}(I^+, I^-)$, it is natural to introduce an ordering relation $\prec$ by declaring $\mathbf{A}' \prec \mathbf{A}$ to mean that $A'_i \subset A_i$ for all $i \in I$. Here, $\mathbf{A}' = (A'_i)_{i \in I}$. Then $G_{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is a nonincreasing function of a condenser, namely

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \leq G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}', \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \quad \text{whenever } \mathbf{A}' \prec \mathbf{A}. \quad (6.1)$$

Given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathfrak{C}$, we denote by $\{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}$ the increasing family of all compact condensers $\mathbf{K} = (K_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathfrak{C}$ such that $\mathbf{K} \prec \mathbf{A}$.

Lemma 6.1 *If $\mathbf{K}$ ranges over $\{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}$, then*

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) = \lim_{\mathbf{K} \uparrow \mathbf{A}} G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (6.2)$$

¹It will also be shown below (see Corollary 7.2) that $\langle W_{\lambda}^i, \lambda^i \rangle = \langle W_{\hat{\lambda}}^i, \hat{\lambda}^i \rangle$ for all $i \in I$.

Proof. We can certainly assume that $G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) < \infty$, since otherwise (6.2) follows at once from (6.1). Then the set $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ must be nonempty; fix μ , one of its elements. Given $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}$ and $i \in I$, let $\mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i$ denote the trace of μ^i upon K_i , i.e., $\mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i := \mu_{K_i}^i$. Applying Lemma 1.2.2 from [11] to g_i , f_{i1} , f_{i2} , and κ , we conclude that

$$\langle g_i, \mu^i \rangle = \lim_{\mathbf{K} \uparrow \mathbf{A}} \langle g_i, \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i \rangle, \quad i \in I, \quad (6.3)$$

$$\langle f_i, \mu^i \rangle = \lim_{\mathbf{K} \uparrow \mathbf{A}} \langle f_i, \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i \rangle, \quad i \in I, \quad (6.4)$$

$$\kappa(\mu^i, \mu^j) = \lim_{\mathbf{K} \uparrow \mathbf{A}} \kappa(\mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i, \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^j), \quad i, j \in I. \quad (6.5)$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By (6.3)–(6.5), for every $i \in I$ one can choose a compact set $K_i^0 \subset A_i$ such that, for all compact sets K_i with the properties $K_i^0 \subset K_i \subset A_i$, the following relations hold:

$$\frac{a_i}{\langle g_i, \mu_{K_i}^i \rangle} < 1 + \varepsilon i^{-2}, \quad (6.6)$$

$$|\langle f_i, \mu^i \rangle - \langle f_i, \mu_{K_i}^i \rangle| < \varepsilon i^{-2}, \quad (6.7)$$

$$|\|\mu^i\|^2 - \|\mu_{K_i}^i\|^2| < \varepsilon^2 i^{-4}. \quad (6.8)$$

Having denoted $\mathbf{K}^0 := (K_i^0)_{i \in I}$, for every $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}$ that follows $\mathbf{K}^0$ we set

$$\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}}^i := \frac{a_i}{\langle g_i, \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i \rangle} \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i, \quad i \in I. \quad (6.9)$$

Then $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}} := (\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}}^i)_{i \in I} \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, the finiteness of the energy being obtained from (6.8) and Lemma 3.3. Furthermore, since $\sum_{i \in I} \langle f_i, \mu^i \rangle$ is absolutely convergent, so is $\sum_{i \in I} \langle f_i, \hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}}^i \rangle$, which is clear from (6.6) and (6.7). Therefore actually $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, and consequently

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}}) \geq G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (6.10)$$

We next proceed by showing that

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mu) = \lim_{\mathbf{K} \uparrow \mathbf{A}} G_{\mathbf{f}}(\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}}). \quad (6.11)$$

To this end, it can be assumed that $\kappa \geq 0$; for if not, then $\mathbf{A}$ must be finite since $\mathbf{X}$ is compact, and (6.11) follows from (6.3)–(6.5). Therefore, for all $\mathbf{K} \succ \mathbf{K}_0$ and $i \in I$ we get

$$\|\mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i\| \leq \|\mu^i\| \leq \|R\mu^+ + R\mu^-\|, \quad (6.12)$$

$$\|\mu^i - \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i\| < \varepsilon i^{-2}, \quad (6.13)$$

the latter being clear from (6.8) because of $\kappa(\mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i, \mu^i - \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i) \geq 0$. Also observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |\|\mu\|^2 - \|\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}}\|^2| &\leq \sum_{i,j \in I} \left| \kappa(\mu^i, \mu^j) - \frac{a_i}{\langle g_i, \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i \rangle} \frac{a_j}{\langle g_j, \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^j \rangle} \kappa(\mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i, \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^j) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i,j \in I} \left[\kappa(\mu^i - \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i, \mu^j) + \kappa(\mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i, \mu^j - \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^j) + \left(\frac{a_i}{\langle g_i, \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i \rangle} \frac{a_j}{\langle g_j, \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^j \rangle} - 1 \right) \kappa(\mu_{\mathbf{K}}^i, \mu_{\mathbf{K}}^j) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

When combined with (6.6), (6.7), (6.12), and (6.13), this yields

$$|G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mu) - G_{\mathbf{f}}(\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}})| \leq M\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{K} \succ \mathbf{K}_0,$$

where M is finite and independent of $\mathbf{K}$, and the required relation (6.11) follows.

Substituting (6.10) into (6.11), in view of the arbitrary choice of $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ we get

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \geq \lim_{\mathbf{K} \uparrow \mathbf{A}} G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})^2.$$

Since the converse inequality is obvious from (6.1), the proof is complete. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{E}_f^0(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ denote the class of all $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ such that, for every $i \in I$, the support $S(\mu^i)$ of μ^i is compact.

Corollary 6.1 *The value $G_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ remains unchanged if the class $\mathcal{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ in its definition is replaced by $\mathcal{E}_f^0(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. That is,*

$$G_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{E}_f^0(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})} G_f(\mu).$$

6.2 When does $G_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) < \infty$ hold?

Let $C(E)$ denote the interior capacity of a set $E \subset X$. Given $\mathbf{g} = (g_i)_{i \in I}$, we also write

$$g_{i,\inf} := \inf_{x \in A_i} g_i(x), \quad g_{i,\sup} := \sup_{x \in A_i} g_i(x).$$

This section provides necessary and (or) sufficient conditions for the class $\mathcal{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ to be nonempty or, which is equivalent, for

$$G_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) < \infty. \quad (6.14)$$

Lemma 6.2 *For (6.14) to hold, it is necessary that*

$$C(\{x \in A_i : |f_i(x)| < \infty\}) \neq 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in I. \quad (6.15)$$

If $\mathbf{A}$ is finite, then (6.14) and (6.15) are actually equivalent.

Proof. If (6.14) holds, then by Corollary 6.1 there is $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_f^0(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Assume, on the contrary, that $C(\{x \in A_{i_0} : |f_{i_0}(x)| < \infty\}) = 0$ for some $i_0 \in I$. Since μ^{i_0} has finite energy and is compactly supported in A_{i_0} , [11, Lemma 2.3.1] yields that $|f_{i_0}(x)| = \infty$ μ^{i_0} -almost everywhere (μ^{i_0} -a. e.) in X . This is impossible, for μ^{i_0} is nonzero while $\langle \mathbf{f}, \mu \rangle$ is finite.

Assuming now $\mathbf{A}$ to be finite, we proceed by proving that (6.15) implies (6.14). For each $i \in I$, the set $E_i := \{x \in A_i : |f_i(x)| < \infty\}$ can be written as the union of E_i^n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $E_i^n := \{x \in A_i : |f_i(x)| \leq n\}$. Taking into account that E_i^n are increasing and universally measurable, from [11, Lemma 2.3.3] we get $C(E_i) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C(E_i^n)$. Since $C(E_i) > 0$ while $\mathbf{A}$ is finite, one can choose n_0 so that $C(E_i^{n_0}) > 0$ for all $i \in I$. Consequently, for every $i \in I$ there is a probability measure ω_i of finite energy, compactly supported in $E_i^{n_0}$.

The function g_i , being continuous, is bounded on $S(\omega_i)$; hence $0 < \langle g_i, \omega_i \rangle < \infty$. Writing

$$\hat{\omega}^i := \frac{a_i \omega_i}{\langle g_i, \omega_i \rangle}, \quad i \in I,$$

we obtain $\hat{\omega} := (\hat{\omega}^i)_{i \in I} \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Since $|\langle f_i, \hat{\omega}^i \rangle| \leq n_0 \hat{\omega}^i(X) < \infty$ for all $i \in I$, we actually have $\hat{\omega} \in \mathcal{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, and the desired relation (6.14) follows. $\square$

However, if $\mathbf{A}$ is infinite, assuming only (6.15) is not enough to guarantee (6.14); then sufficient conditions for (6.14) to hold can be formulated as follows.

Lemma 6.3 *Assume there are constants $M < \infty$ and $\delta > 0$, both independent of i , such that*

$$C(\{x \in A_i : |f_i(x)| \leq M\}) > \delta \quad \text{for all } i \in I.$$

Then (6.14) is true whenever

$$\sum_{i \in I} a_i g_{i,\inf}^{-1} < \infty. \quad (6.16)$$

Proof. For every $i \in I$, we denote $E_i^M := \{x \in A_i : |f_i(x)| \leq M\}$ and choose a probability measure $\omega_i \in \mathcal{E}^+(E_i^M)$ so that

$$\|\omega_i\|^2 \leq C(E_i^M)^{-1} + \delta < \delta + \delta^{-1}.$$

Defining $\hat{\omega}^i$, $i \in I$, by the same formula as in the preceding proof, we then obtain, by (6.16),

$$\sum_{i \in I} \|\hat{\omega}^i\|^2 \leq [\delta + \delta^{-1}] \sum_{i \in I} a_i^2 g_{i,\inf}^{-2} < \infty$$

and hence, by Lemma 3.3, $\hat{\omega} := (\hat{\omega}^i)_{i \in I} \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Since, by (6.16),

$$\sum_{i \in I} |\langle f_i, \hat{\omega}^i \rangle| \leq M \sum_{i \in I} \hat{\omega}^i(X) \leq M \sum_{i \in I} a_i g_{i,\inf}^{-1} < \infty,$$

we actually have $\hat{\omega} \in \mathcal{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, and the claimed conclusion follows. $\square$

7 Description of the f-weighted equilibrium potentials

Given a set $E \subset X$ of interior capacity nonzero and a universally measurable function ψ bounded from below nearly everywhere in E , write

$${}^{\text{"inf"}}_{x \in E} \psi(x) := \sup \{q : \psi(x) \geq q \text{ n.e. in } E\}.$$

Then

$$\psi(x) \geq {}^{\text{"inf"}}_{x \in E} \psi(x) \text{ n.e. in } E,$$

which follows from the fact that the union of a sequence of sets $U_n \cap E$ with $C(U_n \cap E) = 0$ is of interior capacity zero as well, provided U_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are universally measurable whereas E is arbitrary (see the corollary to Lemma 2.3.5 in [11] and the remark attached to it).

7.1 Variational inequalities for the f-weighted equilibrium potentials

Throughout Sect. 7 we assume that an equilibrium measure λ exists (see Theorem 8.1 for conditions ensuring the solvability of the Gauss variational problem). Then, for every $i \in I$, $W_\lambda^i(x)$ is defined and $\neq -\infty$ n.e. in A_i , while $C(A_i) > 0$ as a consequence of Lemma 6.2.

Theorem 7.1 *For all $\lambda \in \mathcal{G}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and $i \in I$,*

$$a_i W_\lambda^i(x) \geq \langle W_\lambda^i, \lambda^i \rangle g_i(x) \text{ n.e. in } A_i. \quad (7.1)$$

Proof. Indeed, λ^i is a solution to the problem of minimizing $G_{\tilde{f}_i}(\nu) = \|\nu\|^2 + 2\langle \tilde{f}_i, \nu \rangle$, where

$$\tilde{f}_i(x) := f_i(x) + \alpha_i \sum_{j \in I, j \neq i} \alpha_j \kappa(x, \lambda^j)$$

and ν ranges over the class $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{f}_i}(A_i, a_i, g_i)$. Applying [24, Th. 2.1], we arrive at (7.1). $\square$

In the following assertion we additionally assume that, for each $i \in I$, either $g_{i,\inf} > 0$ or A_i can be written as a countable union of compact sets. Then every A_i is a countable union of ν^i -integrable sets, where $\nu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is arbitrarily given, and hence any locally ν^i -negligible subset of A_i is ν^i -negligible.

Corollary 7.1 *For all $\lambda \in \mathcal{G}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and $i \in I$,*

$$a_i W_\lambda^i(x) = \langle W_\lambda^i, \lambda^i \rangle g_i(x) \quad \lambda^i\text{-a. e. in } X. \quad (7.2)$$

Proof. Since λ^i has finite energy, the set of all $x \in A_i$ for which the inequality in (7.1) fails to hold is locally λ^i -negligible by [11, Lemma 2.3.1] and, hence, it is λ^i -negligible (cf. the note followed by the corollary). Hence, (7.2) must be true, for if not, we would arrive at a contradiction by integrating the inequality in (7.1) with respect to λ^i . $\square$

Theorem 7.2 *Assume κ is continuous on $A^+ \times A^-$ and satisfies the condition*

$$\sup_{x \in K, y \in A^-} \kappa(x, y) < \infty \quad \text{for all compact } K \subset A^+ \quad (7.3)$$

and that obtained from (7.3) when the indices $+$ and $-$ are reversed. Let moreover $f_i \in \Phi(X)$ for all $i \in I$, and let (6.16) hold true. For every $\lambda \in \mathcal{G}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, then

$$a_i W_\lambda^i(x) \leq \langle W_\lambda^i, \lambda^i \rangle g_i(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in S(\lambda^i) \quad (7.4)$$

and, hence,

$$a_i W_\lambda^i(x) = \langle W_\lambda^i, \lambda^i \rangle g_i(x) \quad \text{n. e. in } S(\lambda^i). \quad (7.5)$$

Proof. Fix $i \in I$ (say $i \in I^+$). We begin by verifying that W_μ^i , where $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is given, is lower semicontinuous on A_i . To this end, it is enough to show that so is $-\kappa(\cdot, R\mu^-)$.

Having fixed a point $x_0 \in A_i$ and its compact neighborhood $V_{x_0} \subset A_i$, let us consider a function $\kappa^*(x, y)$ on $V_{x_0} \times A^-$, defined by the formula

$$\kappa^*(x, y) := -\kappa(x, y) + \sup_{x' \in V_{x_0}, y' \in A^-} \kappa(x', y'). \quad (7.6)$$

Under the assumptions of the theorem, κ^* is nonnegative and continuous; hence,

$$\kappa^*(x, R\mu^-) = \int \kappa^*(x, y) dR\mu^-(y), \quad x \in V_{x_0},$$

being the potential of the nonnegative measure $R\mu^-$ with respect to the kernel κ^* , is lower semicontinuous.

On the other hand, it follows from (6.16) that $R\mu^-$ is bounded. Integrating (7.6) with respect to $R\mu^-$, we conclude from (7.3) that $\kappa^*(x, R\mu^-)$, $x \in V_{x_0}$, coincides up to a finite summand with the restriction of $-\kappa(x, R\mu^-)$ to V_{x_0} . What has been shown just above therefore implies that $-\kappa(\cdot, R\mu^-)$ is lower semicontinuous on A_i . Hence, so is W_μ^i .

To complete the proof, fix $\lambda \in \mathcal{G}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and $x \in S(\lambda^i)$, and let $\mathcal{B}(x)$ be the family of all neighborhoods of x in A_i , directed by $\subset$. For every $U \in \mathcal{B}(x)$, we have $\lambda^i(U) > 0$; hence, by (7.2), one can choose a point $x_U \in U$ so that

$$a_i W_\lambda^i(x_U) = \langle W_\lambda^i, \lambda^i \rangle g_i(x_U).$$

Since the net $(x_U)_{U \in \mathcal{B}(x)}$ converges to x , this proves (7.4) because W_λ^i is lower semicontinuous on A_i while g_i is continuous. Finally, combining (7.1) and (7.4) gives (7.5). $\square$

7.2 Characteristic properties of equilibrium measures

Observing that

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) = G_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda) = \sum_{i \in I} \langle W_{\lambda}^i, \lambda^i \rangle + \langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda \rangle, \quad (7.7)$$

we proceed by showing that (7.1), (7.2) and (7.7) serve as characteristic properties of λ .

Theorem 7.3 *Given $\mu \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, suppose there are numbers η_i such that, for all $i \in I$, either (7.8) and (7.9) or (7.10) and (7.11) hold true, where*

$$a_i W_{\mu}^i(x) \geq \eta_i g(x) \quad \text{n. e. in } A_i, \quad (7.8)$$

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mu) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \eta_i + \langle \mathbf{f}, \mu \rangle \quad (7.9)$$

and

$$a_i W_{\mu}^i(x) \leq \eta_i g(x) \quad \mu^i\text{-a. e. in } X, \quad (7.10)$$

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \geq \sum_{i \in I} \eta_i + \langle \mathbf{f}, \mu \rangle. \quad (7.11)$$

Then μ belongs to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and

$$\eta_i = \langle W_{\mu}^i, \mu^i \rangle \quad \text{for all } i \in I. \quad (7.12)$$

Proof. Assuming (7.8) and (7.9) to hold, fix $\nu \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}^0(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Since ν^i is of finite energy and compactly supported in A_i , [11, Lemma 2.3.1] shows that the inequality in (7.8) holds ν^i -a. e. in X . This gives

$$\langle W_{\mu}^i, \nu^i \rangle \geq \eta_i \quad \text{for all } i \in I. \quad (7.13)$$

Summing up these inequalities and then substituting (7.9) into the result obtained, we get

$$\kappa(\nu, \mu) + \langle \mathbf{f}, \nu \rangle \geq \|\mu\|^2 + \langle \mathbf{f}, \mu \rangle,$$

which in turn yields

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\nu) - G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mu) \geq \|\nu - \mu\|^2.$$

Application of Corollary 6.1 therefore implies that μ is an equilibrium measure.

Further, for all $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}$ large enough consider $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}}^i$ defined by (6.9). Applying (7.13) to $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{K}}^i$ instead of ν^i and then letting $\mathbf{K} \uparrow \mathbf{A}$, by arguments similar to those used in the proof of Lemma 6.1 we get $\langle W_{\mu}^i, \mu^i \rangle \geq \eta_i$ for all $i \in I$. Summing up these inequalities and then comparing the result obtained with (7.7) for λ replaced by μ and (7.9), we obtain (7.12).

Since the remaining case can be handled in a similar way, the proof is complete. $\square$

Corollary 7.2 $\langle W_{\lambda}^i, \lambda^i \rangle = \langle W_{\hat{\lambda}}^i, \hat{\lambda}^i \rangle$ for any $\lambda, \hat{\lambda} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and all $i \in I$.

Corollary 7.3 *Given $\lambda \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, we have*

$$\langle W_{\lambda}^i, \lambda^i \rangle = \inf_{x \in A_i} \frac{a_i W_{\lambda}^i(x)}{g(x)} \quad \text{for all } i \in I \quad (7.14)$$

and, hence,

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda) = \sum_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in A_i} \frac{a_i W_{\lambda}^i(x)}{g(x)} + \langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda \rangle.$$

7.3 $\mathbf{f}$ -weighted equilibrium constants

Definition 7.1 We shall call the numbers $\langle W_\lambda^i, \lambda^i \rangle$, $i \in I$, where $\lambda \in \mathcal{G}_\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is arbitrarily given, the *$\mathbf{f}$ -weighted equilibrium constants* corresponding to the data $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{g}$, and $\mathbf{f}$.

These constants do not depend on the choice of $\lambda \in \mathcal{G}_\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, which is clear from Corollary 7.2. They can also be uniquely determined as η_i , $i \in I$, satisfying both the relations (7.8) and (7.9) with $\lambda \in \mathcal{G}_\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ in place of μ . Another alternative definition of the $\mathbf{f}$ -weighted equilibrium constants can be given by (7.14).

8 Equilibrium measures: existence and $\mathbf{A}$ -vague compactness. Statements on continuity

Assume for a moment that a condenser $\mathbf{A}$ is compact. Then the class $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely bounded and closed and hence, by Lemma 3.1, it is $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely compact. If moreover $\mathbf{A}$ is finite, κ is continuous on $A^+ \times A^-$, while $f_i \in \Phi(X)$ for all $i \in I$, then $G_\mathbf{f}(\mu)$ is $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely lower semicontinuous on $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ and, therefore, the existence of equilibrium measures λ immediately follows. See [24, Th. 2.30]; cf. also [14, 16, 23, 25].

However, these arguments break down if any of the above assumptions is dropped. In particular, $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is no longer $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely compact if $\mathbf{A}$ is noncompact.

To solve the problem on the existence of equilibrium measures in the general case where a condenser $\mathbf{A}$ is infinite and (or) noncompact, we develop an approach based on both the $\mathbf{A}$ -vague and strong topologies in the semimetric space $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$, introduced for measures of finite dimensions in [27, 28, 29, 30].

8.1 Standing assumptions

Unless explicitly stated otherwise, in all that follows it is required that the kernel κ is consistent and either $I^- = \emptyset$, or (6.16) and the following condition are both satisfied:

$$\sup_{x \in A^+, y \in A^-} \kappa(x, y) < \infty. \quad (8.1)$$

It will also be assumed that $G_\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) < \infty$, which certainly involves no loss of generality, since otherwise the Gauss variational problem makes no sense; see Sect. 6.2 for necessary and (or) sufficient conditions for this to hold.

Throughout Sections 8.2 and 8.3 we shall also suppose one of the following Cases I, II, or III to occur:

- I. There exists a vector measure $\nu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ such that $\mathbf{f} = \kappa_\nu$;
- II. There exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $f_i = \alpha_i \kappa(\cdot, \sigma)$ for all $i \in I$;
- III. $f_i \in \Phi(X)$ for all $i \in I$.

Remark 8.1 In all the Cases I, II, or III, the restrictions on $\mathbf{f}$ that have been imposed in Sect. 4 do hold automatically.

Remark 8.2 Note that the above assumptions on a kernel are not too restrictive. In particular, they all are satisfied by the Newtonian, Riesz, or Green kernels in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, provided the Euclidean distance between A^+ and A^- is nonzero.

8.2 Statements on existence and $\mathbf{A}$ -vague compactness

Theorem 8.1 *Under the standing assumptions, let moreover for every $i \in I$ either $g_{i,\sup} < \infty$ or there exist $r_i \in (1, \infty)$ and $\omega_i \in \mathcal{E}$ such that*

$$g_i^{r_i}(x) \leq \kappa(x, \omega_i) \quad \text{n.e. in } A_i. \quad (8.2)$$

If, in addition, A_i either is compact or has finite interior capacity², then the class of equilibrium measures $\mathcal{G}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is nonempty and $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely compact.

Corollary 8.1 *If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{K}$ is compact, then $\mathcal{G}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is nonempty and $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely compact.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 8.1, for g_i is bounded on K_i . $\square$

8.3 On continuity of equilibrium measures and f -weighted equilibrium constants

When approaching $\mathbf{A}$ by the increasing family $\{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}$ of the compact condensers $\mathbf{K} \prec \mathbf{A}$, we shall always suppose all those $\mathbf{K}$ to satisfy the assumption $G_f(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) < \infty$. This involves no loss of generality, which is clear from the assumption (6.14) and Lemma 6.1. Choose an equilibrium measure $\lambda_{\mathbf{K}} \in \mathcal{G}_f(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ — its existence has been ensured by Corollary 8.1.

Theorem 8.2 *Let all the conditions of Theorem 8.1 be satisfied. Then every $\mathbf{A}$ -vague cluster point of $(\lambda_{\mathbf{K}})_{\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}}$ (such a cluster point exists) belongs to $\mathcal{G}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Furthermore, if $\lambda_{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathcal{G}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is arbitrarily given, then*

$$\lim_{\mathbf{K} \uparrow \mathbf{A}} \|\lambda_{\mathbf{K}} - \lambda_{\mathbf{A}}\|^2 = 0, \quad (8.3)$$

$$\lim_{\mathbf{K} \uparrow \mathbf{A}} \langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda_{\mathbf{K}} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda_{\mathbf{A}} \rangle, \quad (8.4)$$

$$\lim_{\mathbf{K} \uparrow \mathbf{A}} \langle W_{\lambda_{\mathbf{K}}}^i, \lambda_{\mathbf{K}}^i \rangle = \langle W_{\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}}^i, \lambda_{\mathbf{A}}^i \rangle \quad \text{for all } i \in I. \quad (8.5)$$

Thus, under the assumptions of Theorem 8.2, if moreover κ is strictly positive definite and all A_i , $i \in I$, are mutually disjoint, then the (unique) equilibrium measure $\lambda_{\mathbf{K}}$ on $\mathbf{K}$ converges both $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely and strongly to the (unique) equilibrium measure $\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}$ on $\mathbf{A}$.

The proofs of Theorems 8.1 and 8.2, to be given in Sections 11 and 12 below (see also Sect. 10 for auxiliary notions and results), are based on a theorem on the strong completeness of proper subspaces of the semimetric space $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$, which is a subject of the next section.

9 Strong completeness of vector measures

As always, assume all the standing assumptions, stated in Sect. 8.1, to hold. Having denoted

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}) : \langle g_i, \mu^i \rangle \leq a_i \text{ for all } i \in I\},$$

we consider $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) := \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \cap \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ to be a topological subspace of the semimetric space $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$; the induced topology is likewise called the *strong* topology.

Our purpose is to show that $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is strongly complete.

²Note that a compact set $K \subset X$ might be of infinite capacity; $C(K)$ is necessarily finite provided the kernel is strictly positive definite [11]. On the other hand, even for the Newtonian kernel sets of finite capacity might be noncompact (see [19]).

9.1 Auxiliary assertions

Lemma 9.1 *The class $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely bounded and, hence, $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely compact.*

Proof. Fix $i \in I$, and let a compact set $K_i \subset A_i$ be given. Since g_i is positive and continuous, the relation

$$a_i \geq \langle g_i, \mu^i \rangle \geq \mu^i(K_i) \min_{x \in K_i} g_i(x), \quad \text{where } \mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}),$$

yields

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})} \mu^i(K_i) < \infty.$$

This implies that $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely bounded and hence, by Lemma 3.1, $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely relatively compact. Since it is obviously $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely closed, the lemma follows. $\square$

Lemma 9.2 *If a net $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \subset \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is strongly bounded, then its $\mathbf{A}$ -vague cluster set is contained in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 9.1, the $\mathbf{A}$ -vague adherence of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ is nonempty and contained in $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. To establish the lemma, it is enough to show that every its element μ is of finite energy.

Observe that, by (3.5), the net of scalar measures $(R\mu_s)_{s \in S} \subset \mathcal{E}$ is strongly bounded. We proceed by proving that so are $(R\mu_s^+)_{s \in S}$ and $(R\mu_s^-)_{s \in S}$, i.e.,

$$\sup_{s \in S} \|R\mu_s^\pm\|^2 < \infty. \quad (9.1)$$

Of course, this needs to be verified only when $I^- \neq \emptyset$; then, according to the standing assumptions, both (6.16) and (8.1) hold. Since $\langle g_i, \mu^i \rangle \leq a_i$, we get

$$\sup_{s \in S} \mu_s^i(\mathbf{X}) \leq a_i g_{i, \inf}^{-1} \quad \text{for all } i \in I. \quad (9.2)$$

Consequently, by (6.16),

$$\sup_{s \in S} R\mu_s^\pm(\mathbf{X}) \leq \sum_{i \in I} a_i g_{i, \inf}^{-1} < \infty.$$

Because of (8.1), this implies that $\kappa(R\mu_s^+, R\mu_s^-)$ remains bounded from above on S ; hence, so do $\|R\mu_s^+\|^2$ and $\|R\mu_s^-\|^2$.

If $(\mu_d)_{d \in D}$ is a subnet of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ that converges $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely to μ , then, by Lemma 3.2, $(R\mu_d^+)_{d \in D}$ and $(R\mu_d^-)_{d \in D}$ converge vaguely to $R\mu^+$ and $R\mu^-$, respectively. Therefore, applying Lemma 3.4 with $Y = X \times X$ and $\psi = \kappa$, we conclude from (9.1) that $R\mu^+$ and $R\mu^-$ are both of finite energy. Because of (3.5), this yields $\kappa(\mu, \mu) < \infty$, as was to be proved. $\square$

Corollary 9.1 *If a net $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \subset \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is strongly bounded, then for every $i \in I$,*

$$\sup_{s \in S} \|\mu_s^i\|^2 < \infty. \quad (9.3)$$

Proof. It is clear from (9.1) that the required relation will be established once we prove

$$\sum_{i, j \in I^\pm} \kappa(\mu_s^i, \mu_s^j) \geq C > -\infty, \quad (9.4)$$

where C is independent of s . Since (9.4) is obvious when $\kappa \geq 0$, we assume $\mathbf{X}$ to be compact. Then κ , being lower semicontinuous, is bounded from below on $\mathbf{X}$ (say by $-c$, where $c > 0$), while $\mathbf{A}$ is finite. Furthermore, then $g_{i, \inf} > 0$; therefore, (9.2) holds true. This implies that $\kappa(\mu_s^i, \mu_s^j) \geq -a_i a_j g_{i, \inf}^{-1} g_{j, \inf}^{-1} c$ for all $i, j \in I$, and (9.4) follows. $\square$

9.2 Strong completeness of $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$

Theorem 9.1 *The semimetric space $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is complete. In more detail, if $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ is a strong Cauchy net in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and μ is its $\mathbf{A}$ -vague cluster point (such a μ exists), then $\mu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and*

$$\lim_{s \in S} \|\mu_s - \mu\|^2 = 0. \quad (9.5)$$

Assume, in addition, that the kernel κ is strictly positive definite and all $A_i, i \in I$, are mutually disjoint. If moreover $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \subset \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ converges strongly to $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$, then actually $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and $\mu_s \rightarrow \mu_0$ $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely.

Proof. Fix a strong Cauchy net $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \subset \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Since such a net converges strongly to every its strong cluster point, $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ can certainly be assumed to be strongly bounded. Then, by Lemmas 9.1 and 9.2, there exists an $\mathbf{A}$ -vague cluster point μ of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ and

$$\mu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (9.6)$$

We next proceed by verifying (9.5). Of course, there is no loss of generality in assuming $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ to converge $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely to μ . Then, by Lemma 3.2, $(R\mu_s^+)_{s \in S}$ and $(R\mu_s^-)_{s \in S}$ converge vaguely to $R\mu^+$ and $R\mu^-$, respectively. Since, by (9.1), these nets are strongly bounded in $\mathcal{E}^+$, the property (C₂) (see Sect. 2) shows that they approach $R\mu^+$ and $R\mu^-$, respectively, in the weak topology as well, and so $R\mu_s \rightarrow R\mu$ weakly. This gives, by (3.7),

$$\|\mu_s - \mu\|^2 = \|R\mu_s - R\mu\|^2 = \lim_{l \in S} \kappa(R\mu_s - R\mu, R\mu_s - R\mu_l),$$

and hence, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\|\mu_s - \mu\|^2 \leq \|\mu_s - \mu\| \liminf_{l \in S} \|\mu_s - \mu_l\|,$$

which proves (9.5) as required, because $\|\mu_s - \mu_l\|$ becomes arbitrarily small when $s, l \in S$ are large enough.

Suppose now that κ is strictly positive definite, while all $A_i, i \in I$, are mutually disjoint, and let the net $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ converge strongly to some $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$. Given an $\mathbf{A}$ -vague limit point μ of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$, we conclude from (9.5) that $\|\mu_0 - \mu\| = 0$, hence $R\mu_0 = R\mu$ since κ is strictly positive definite, and finally $\mu_0 = \mu$ because $A_i, i \in I$, are mutually disjoint. In view of (9.6), this means that $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, which is a part of the desired conclusion. Moreover, μ_0 has thus been shown to be identical to any $\mathbf{A}$ -vague cluster point of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$. Since the $\mathbf{A}$ -vague topology is Hausdorff, this implies that μ_0 is actually the $\mathbf{A}$ -vague limit of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ (cf. [1, Chap. I, § 9, n° 1, cor.]), which completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 9.1 In view of the fact that the semimetric space $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is isometric to its R -image, Theorem 9.1 has thus singled out a *strongly complete* topological subspace of the pre-Hilbert space $\mathcal{E}$, whose elements are *signed* measures. This is of independent interest since, according to a well-known counterexample by H. Cartan [4], all the space $\mathcal{E}$ is strongly incomplete even for the Newtonian kernel $|x - y|^{2-n}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n, n \geq 3$.

Remark 9.2 Assume κ is strictly positive definite (hence, perfect). If moreover $I^- = \emptyset$, then Theorem 9.1 remains valid for $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ in place of $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ (cf. Theorem 2.1). A question still unanswered is whether this is the case if I^+ and I^- are both nonempty. We can however show that this is really so for the Riesz kernels $|x - y|^{\alpha-n}, 0 < \alpha < n$, in $\mathbb{R}^n, n \geq 2$ (cf. [26, Th. 1]). The proof utilizes Deny's theorem [5] stating that, for the Riesz kernels, $\mathcal{E}$ can be completed with making use of distributions of finite energy.

10 Extremal measures in the Gauss variational problem

To apply Theorem 9.1 to the Gauss variational problem, we next proceed by introducing the concept of extremal measure defined as a strong and, simultaneously, the $\mathbf{A}$ -vague limit of a minimizing net. See below for strict definitions and related auxiliary results.

Except for Corollary 10.2, in addition to the standing assumptions we suppose that

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) > -\infty. \quad (10.1)$$

10.1 Extremal measures: existence, uniqueness, and $\mathbf{A}$ -vague compactness

Definition 10.1 We call a net $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ *minimizing* if $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}^0(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and

$$\lim_{s \in S} G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mu_s) = G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (10.2)$$

Let $\mathbb{M}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ consist of all minimizing nets; note that it is nonempty, which is clear from (6.14) and Corollary 6.1. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ the union of the $\mathbf{A}$ -vague cluster sets of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$, where $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ ranges over $\mathbb{M}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$.

Definition 10.2 We call $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$ *extremal* if there exists $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathbb{M}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ that converges to γ both strongly and $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely; such a net $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ is said to *generate* γ . The class of all extremal measures will be denoted by $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$.

Lemma 10.1 *The following assertions hold true:*

- (i) *From every minimizing net one can select a subnet generating an extremal measure; hence, $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is nonempty. Furthermore,*

$$\mathfrak{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \subset \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \quad (10.3)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (10.4)$$

- (ii) *Every minimizing net converges strongly to every extremal measure; hence, $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is contained in an equivalence class in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A})$.*
- (iii) *The class $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely compact.*

Proof. Fix $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ and $(\nu_t)_{t \in T}$ in $\mathbb{M}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Then

$$\lim_{(s, t) \in S \times T} \|\mu_s - \nu_t\|^2 = 0, \quad (10.5)$$

where $S \times T$ denotes the directed product of the directed sets S and T (see, e.g., [18, Chap. 2, § 3]). Indeed, since $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}}^0(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is convex, in the same manner as in the proof of Lemma 5.1 we get

$$0 \leq \|R\mu_s - R\nu_t\|^2 \leq -4G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) + 2G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mu_s) + 2G_{\mathbf{f}}(\nu_t),$$

which yields (10.5) when combined with (10.2).

Relation (10.5) implies that $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ is strongly fundamental. Therefore, by Theorem 9.1, there is an $\mathbf{A}$ -vague cluster point μ_0 of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$, $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \leq \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, and $\mu_s \rightarrow \mu_0$ strongly.

This means that μ_0 is an extremal measure and, hence, $\mathcal{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \subset \mathfrak{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Since the inverse inclusion is obvious, relations (10.3) and (10.4) follow.

To verify (ii), fix $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathbb{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and $\gamma \in \mathfrak{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Then, by Definition 10.2, one can choose a net in $\mathbb{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, say $(\nu_t)_{t \in T}$, that converges to γ strongly. Repeated application of (10.5) shows that also $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ converges to γ strongly, as claimed.

To establish (iii), it is enough to prove that $\mathcal{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely compact. Fix $(\gamma_s)_{s \in S} \subset \mathcal{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. It follows from (10.3) and Lemma 9.1 that there exists an $\mathbf{A}$ -vague cluster point γ_0 of $(\gamma_s)_{s \in S}$; let $(\gamma_t)_{t \in T}$ be a subnet of $(\gamma_s)_{s \in S}$ that converges $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely to γ_0 . Then for every $t \in T$ one can choose $(\mu_{s_t})_{s_t \in S_t} \in \mathbb{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ converging $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely to γ_t . Consider the Cartesian product $\prod \{S_t : t \in T\}$ — that is, the collection of all functions β on T with $\beta(t) \in S_t$, and let D denote the directed product $T \times \prod \{S_t : t \in T\}$. Given $(t, \beta) \in D$, write $\mu_{(t, \beta)} := \mu_{\beta(t)}$. Then the theorem on iterated limits from [18, Chap. 2, § 4] yields that the net $(\mu_{(t, \beta)})_{(t, \beta) \in D}$ belongs to $\mathbb{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and converges $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely to γ_0 . Thus, $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ as was to be proved. $\square$

Corollary 10.1 *Every equilibrium measure λ (if exists) is extremal, i. e.,*

$$\mathcal{G}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \subset \mathfrak{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (10.6)$$

If $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathbb{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is arbitrarily given, then $\mu_s \rightarrow \lambda$ strongly and, moreover,

$$\lim_{s \in S} \langle f, \mu_s \rangle = \langle f, \lambda \rangle. \quad (10.7)$$

Proof. For every $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}$ large enough consider $\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{K}} := (\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{K}}^i)_{i \in I}$, where $\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{K}}^i$ is given by (6.9) with $\mu = \lambda$. Then $(\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{K}})_{\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}}$ belongs to $\mathbb{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, which is clear from (6.11) with μ replaced by λ . On the other hand, this net converges $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely to λ ; hence, $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Therefore, in accordance with (10.4), λ has to be extremal.

Fix $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathbb{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$; then $\mu_s \rightarrow \lambda$ strongly, which is a consequence of (10.6) and Lemma 10.1, (ii). This implies that $\lim_{s \in S} \|\mu_s\|^2 = \|\lambda\|^2$. On the other hand, by (10.2),

$$\|\lambda\|^2 + 2\langle f, \lambda \rangle = G_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) = \lim_{s \in S} [\|\mu_s\|^2 + 2\langle f, \mu_s \rangle].$$

The last two relations combined give (10.7), and the proof is complete. $\square$

Corollary 10.2 *Assume that Case I or II occurs. Then $G_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) > -\infty$ and, moreover,*

$$G_f(\gamma) = G_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \mathfrak{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (10.8)$$

Proof. Suppose Case II takes place; then $f_i = \alpha_i \kappa(\cdot, \sigma)$ for all $i \in I$, where $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$. Hence,

$$\langle f, \mu \rangle = \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i \int \kappa(x, \sigma) d\mu^i(x) = \kappa(\sigma, R\mu) \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}),$$

the latter equality being a consequence of Lemma 3.5. This implies

$$G_f(\mu) = \|\mu\|^2 + 2\kappa(\sigma, R\mu) = \|R\mu + \sigma\|^2 - \|\sigma\|^2. \quad (10.9)$$

Therefore $G_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \geq -\|\sigma\|^2 > -\infty$, which enables us to use Lemma 10.1.

Applying (10.9) to μ_s , $s \in S$, and γ , where $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathbb{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and $\gamma \in \mathfrak{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ are arbitrarily given, in view of the fact that $\mu_s \rightarrow \gamma$ strongly we get

$$G_f(\gamma) = \|R\gamma + \sigma\|^2 - \|\sigma\|^2 = \lim_{s \in S} [\|R\mu_s + \sigma\|^2 - \|\sigma\|^2] = \lim_{s \in S} G_f(\mu_s).$$

Substituting (10.2) into the preceding relation yields (10.8).

Since, by (3.6), Case I can be reduced to Case II with $\sigma = R\nu$, the proof is complete. $\square$

10.2 Extremal measures: g_i -masses of the i -components

Lemma 10.2 Fix $i \in I$ and assume that either $g_{i,\sup} < \infty$ or (8.2) holds for some $r_i \in (1, \infty)$ and $\omega_i \in \mathcal{E}$. If moreover A_i either is compact or has finite interior capacity, then

$$\langle g_i, \gamma^i \rangle = a_i \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \mathfrak{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (10.10)$$

Proof. Fix $\gamma \in \mathfrak{E}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ and choose $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathbb{M}_f(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ generating γ . Taking a subnet if necessary, one can assume $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ to be strongly bounded. Then, by (9.3), so is $(\mu_s^i)_{s \in S}$.

Of course, (10.10) needs to be proved only if the set A_i is noncompact; then its capacity has to be finite. Hence, by [11, Th. 4.1], for every $E \subset A_i$ there exists a measure $\theta_E \in \mathcal{E}^+(\overline{E})$, called an interior equilibrium measure associated with E , which possesses the properties

$$\theta_E(X) = \|\theta_E\|^2 = C(E), \quad (10.11)$$

$$\kappa(x, \theta_E) \geq 1 \quad \text{n.e. in } E. \quad (10.12)$$

Also observe that there is no loss of generality in assuming g_i to satisfy (8.2) with some $r_i \in (1, \infty)$ and $\omega_i \in \mathcal{E}$. Indeed, otherwise g_i has to be bounded from above (say by M), which combined with (10.12) again gives (8.2) for $\omega_i := M^{r_i} \theta_{A_i}$, $r_i \in (1, \infty)$ being arbitrary.

To establish (10.10), we treat A_i as a locally compact space with the topology induced from X . Given a set $E \subset A_i$, let χ_E denote its characteristic function and let $E^c := A_i \setminus E$. Further, let $\{K_i\}$ be the increasing family of all compact subsets K_i of A_i . Since $g_i \chi_{K_i}$ is upper semicontinuous on A_i while $(\mu_s^i)_{s \in S}$ converges to γ^i vaguely, for every $K_i \in \{K_i\}$

$$\langle g_i \chi_{K_i}, \gamma^i \rangle \geq \limsup_{s \in S} \langle g_i \chi_{K_i}, \mu_s^i \rangle$$

according to Lemma 3.4. On the other hand, application of Lemma 1.2.2 from [11] yields

$$\langle g_i, \gamma^i \rangle = \lim_{K_i \in \{K_i\}} \langle g_i \chi_{K_i}, \gamma^i \rangle.$$

Combining the last two relations, we obtain

$$a_i \geq \langle g_i, \gamma^i \rangle \geq \limsup_{(s, K_i) \in S \times \{K_i\}} \langle g_i \chi_{K_i}, \mu_s^i \rangle = a_i - \liminf_{(s, K_i) \in S \times \{K_i\}} \langle g_i \chi_{K_i^c}, \mu_s^i \rangle,$$

$S \times \{K_i\}$ being the directed product of the directed sets S and $\{K_i\}$. Hence, if we prove

$$\liminf_{(s, K_i) \in S \times \{K_i\}} \langle g_i \chi_{K_i^c}, \mu_s^i \rangle = 0, \quad (10.13)$$

the desired relation (10.10) follows.

Consider an interior equilibrium measure $\theta_{K_i^c}$, where $K_i \in \{K_i\}$ is given. Then application of Lemma 4.1.1 and Theorem 4.1 from [11] shows that

$$\|\theta_{K_i^c} - \theta_{\tilde{K}_i^c}\|^2 \leq \|\theta_{K_i^c}\|^2 - \|\theta_{\tilde{K}_i^c}\|^2 \quad \text{provided } K_i \subset \tilde{K}_i.$$

Furthermore, it is clear from (10.11) that the net $\|\theta_{K_i^c}\|$, $K_i \in \{K_i\}$, is bounded and non-increasing, and hence fundamental in $\mathbb{R}$. The preceding inequality thus yields that the net $(\theta_{K_i^c})_{K_i \in \{K_i\}}$ is strongly fundamental in $\mathcal{E}$. Since, clearly, it converges vaguely to zero, the property (C₁) (see. Sec. 2) implies immediately that zero is also one of its strong limits and, hence,

$$\lim_{K_i \in \{K_i\}} \|\theta_{K_i^c}\| = 0. \quad (10.14)$$

Write $q_i := r_i(r_i - 1)^{-1}$, where $r_i \in (1, \infty)$ is a number involved in condition (8.2). Combining (8.2) with (10.12) shows that the inequality

$$g_i(x) \chi_{K_i^c}(x) \leq \kappa(x, \omega_i)^{1/r_i} \kappa(x, \theta_{K_i^c})^{1/q_i}$$

subsists n. e. in A_i , and hence μ_s^i -a. e. in X by virtue of [11, Lemma 2.3.1] and the fact that μ_s^i is a measure of finite energy, compactly supported in A_i . Having integrated this relation with respect to μ_s^i , we then apply the Hölder and, subsequently, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities to the integrals on the right. This gives

$$\langle g_i \chi_{K_i^c}, \mu_s^i \rangle \leq \left[\int \kappa(x, \omega_i) d\mu_s^i(x) \right]^{1/r_i} \left[\int \kappa(x, \theta_{K_i^c}) d\mu_s^i(x) \right]^{1/q_i} \leq \|\omega_i\|^{1/r_i} \|\theta_{K_i^c}\|^{1/q_i} \|\mu_s^i\|.$$

Taking limits here along $S \times \{K\}$ and using (9.3) and (10.14), we obtain (10.13) as desired. $\square$

11 Proof of Theorem 8.1

We begin by verifying relation (10.1). This needs to be done only in Case III, because in the remaining Cases I and II it has already been established by Corollary 10.2. In view of the positive definiteness of the kernel, it suffices to show that

$$\langle \mathbf{f}, \mu \rangle \geq -M_0 > -\infty \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (11.1)$$

Assume X to be compact, since otherwise $f_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in I$ and (11.1) is obvious. Then $\mathbf{A}$ is finite and, for every $i \in I$, $g_{i,\inf} > 0$ while f_i , being lower semicontinuous, is bounded from below. This implies (11.1) when combined with the inequalities $\mu^i(X) \leq a_i g_{i,\inf}^{-1} < \infty$.

Due to (10.1), we are able to use the results from Sect. 10. Fix an extremal measure γ — it exists according to Lemma 10.1, and choose a net $(\mu_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathbb{M}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ that converges to γ both strongly and $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely. We are going to prove that γ is an equilibrium measure.

Observe that, by Lemma 10.2, $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Hence, the desired inclusion $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ will have been established once we show that $\langle \mathbf{f}, \gamma \rangle > -\infty$ and

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\gamma) \leq G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (11.2)$$

To this end, one can again assume Case III to occur, for otherwise this has already been obtained by Corollary 10.2. Then $\langle \mathbf{f}, \gamma \rangle > -\infty$ by (11.1) for γ instead of μ . Furthermore, from the strong and the $\mathbf{A}$ -vague convergence of $(\mu_s)_{s \in S}$ to γ we respectively get

$$G_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) = \lim_{s \in S} [\|\mu_s\|^2 + 2\langle f, \mu_s \rangle] = \|\gamma\|^2 + 2 \lim_{s \in S} \langle f, \mu_s \rangle$$

and

$$\sum_{i \in I} \langle f_i, \gamma^i \rangle \leq \sum_{i \in I} \liminf_{s \in S} \langle f_i, \mu_s^i \rangle \leq \lim_{s \in S} \sum_{i \in I} \langle f_i, \mu_s^i \rangle.$$

The last two relations combined give (11.2).

What has thus been proved means that the Gauss variational problem is solvable; actually, $\mathfrak{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$. Together with (10.4) and (10.6), this yields

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) = \mathfrak{E}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (11.3)$$

Therefore Lemma 10.1, (iii), implies that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ is $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely compact. $\square$

12 Proof of Theorem 8.2

Fix $\lambda_{\mathbf{K}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, where $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}$, and $\lambda_{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$ — the existence of such equilibrium measures has been ensured by Theorem 8.1 and Corollary 8.1. According to Lemma 6.1,

$$(\lambda_{\mathbf{K}})_{\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}} \in \mathbb{M}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}). \quad (12.1)$$

Therefore, by (11.3), every $\mathbf{A}$ -vague cluster point of $(\lambda_{\mathbf{K}})_{\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$, which is a part of the desired conclusion. Furthermore, the claimed relations (8.3) and (8.4) are obtained directly from (12.1) and Corollary 10.1. What is thus left is to establish (8.5).

Consider an arbitrary cluster point d_i of $\langle W_{\lambda_{\mathbf{K}}}^i, \lambda_{\mathbf{K}}^i \rangle$, where $\mathbf{K}$ ranges over $\{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}$. Then application of Lemma 10.1, (i), implies that there exists a subnet $(\lambda_s)_{s \in S}$ of $(\lambda_{\mathbf{K}})_{\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}}$, strongly and $\mathbf{A}$ -vaguely convergent (say to λ) and such that

$$d_i = \lim_{s \in S} \langle W_{\lambda_s}^i, \lambda_s^i \rangle. \quad (12.2)$$

Also observe that, by (11.3) and (12.1), $\lambda \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g})$; hence, by Corollary 7.2,

$$\langle W_{\lambda}^i, \lambda^i \rangle = \langle W_{\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}}^i, \lambda_{\mathbf{A}}^i \rangle. \quad (12.3)$$

We proceed by showing that, for every $i \in I$,

$$\langle \kappa_{\lambda}^i, \lambda^i \rangle = \lim_{s \in S} \langle \kappa_{\lambda_s}^i, \lambda_s^i \rangle, \quad (12.4)$$

$$\langle f_i, \lambda^i \rangle = \lim_{s \in S} \langle f_i, \lambda_s^i \rangle. \quad (12.5)$$

Without loss of generality, $(\lambda_s)_{s \in S}$ can certainly be assumed to be strongly bounded. Then, by Corollary 9.1, so is $(\lambda_s^i)_{s \in S}$. Since, moreover, $\lambda_s^i \rightarrow \lambda^i$ vaguely, the property (C₂) implies that λ_s^i approaches λ^i also weakly. Hence, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $|\kappa(\lambda^i - \lambda_s^i, R\lambda)| < \varepsilon$ whenever $s \in S$ is large enough. Furthermore, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$|\kappa(\lambda_s^i, R\lambda) - \kappa(\lambda_s^i, R\lambda_s)| = |\kappa(\lambda_s^i, R\lambda - R\lambda_s)| \leq M_1 \|\lambda - \lambda_s\|^2, \quad s \in S.$$

Since $\lambda_s \rightarrow \lambda$ strongly, the last two relations combined yield

$$\kappa(\lambda^i, R\lambda) = \lim_{s \in S} \kappa(\lambda_s^i, R\lambda_s),$$

which in view of (3.6) is equivalent to (12.4).

To establish (12.5), we can restrict ourselves to Case III, for otherwise it is obtained directly from the weak convergence of $(\lambda_s^i)_{s \in S}$ to λ^i . Then it follows from the $\mathbf{A}$ -vague convergence of $(\lambda_s)_{s \in S}$ to λ that

$$\langle f_i, \lambda^i \rangle \leq \liminf_{s \in S} \langle f_i, \lambda_s^i \rangle \quad \text{for all } i \in I \quad (12.6)$$

and therefore, by (10.7),

$$\langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda \rangle = \sum_{i \in I} \langle f_i, \lambda^i \rangle \leq \sum_{i \in I} \liminf_{s \in S} \langle f_i, \lambda_s^i \rangle \leq \lim_{s \in S} \langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda_s \rangle = \langle \mathbf{f}, \lambda \rangle.$$

Comparing the last two relations yields that an equality in (12.6) actually has to hold. Since the same arguments can be applied to any subnet of $(\lambda_s)_{s \in S}$, (12.5) follows.

Combining (12.2)–(12.5) shows that $d_i = \langle W_{\lambda_{\mathbf{A}}}^i, \lambda_{\mathbf{A}}^i \rangle$. Since this has been established for any cluster point d_i of $\langle W_{\lambda_{\mathbf{K}}}^i, \lambda_{\mathbf{K}}^i \rangle$, where $\mathbf{K} \in \{\mathbf{K}\}_{\mathbf{A}}$, the claimed relation (8.5) is proved. $\square$

13 Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Professors A. Yu. Rashkovskii and W. L. Wendland for the careful reading of the manuscript and their suggestions to improve it.

A part of this research was done during the author's visits to the University Stuttgart and the Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach during April–May of 2009, and the author acknowledges these institutions for the support and the excellent working conditions.

References

- [1] N. Bourbaki, *Topologie générale, Chap. I–II*, Actualités Sci. Ind., 1142, Paris (1951).
- [2] N. Bourbaki, *Intégration, Chap. I–IV*, Actualités Sci. Ind., 1175, Paris (1952).
- [3] N. Bourbaki, *Intégration des mesures*, Actualités Sci. Ind., 1244, Paris (1956).
- [4] H. Cartan, *Théorie du potentiel newtonien: énergie, capacité, suites de potentiels*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **73** (1945), 74–106.
- [5] J. Deny, *Les potentiels d'énergie finie*, Acta Math. **82** (1950), 107–183.
- [6] J. Deny, *Sur la définition de l'énergie en théorie du potentiel*, Ann. Inst. Fourier Grenoble **2** (1950), 83–99.
- [7] P. D. Dragnev, E. B. Saff, *Riesz spherical potentials with external fields and minimal energy points separation*, Potential Anal. **26** (2007), 139–162.
- [8] R. Edwards, *Cartan's balayage theory for hyperbolic Riemann surfaces*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **8** (1958), 263–272.
- [9] R. Edwards, *Functional analysis. Theory and applications*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York (1965).
- [10] O. Frostman, *Potentiel d'équilibre et capacité des ensembles avec quelques applications à la théorie des fonctions*, Comm. Sémin. Math. Univ. Lund **3** (1935), 1–118.
- [11] B. Fuglede, *On the theory of potentials in locally compact spaces*, Acta Math. **103** (1960), 139–215.
- [12] B. Fuglede, *Caractérisation des noyaux consistants en théorie du potentiel*, Comptes Rendus **255** (1962), 241–243.
- [13] C. F. Gauss, *Allgemeine Lehrsätze in Beziehung auf die im verkehrten Verhältnisse des Quadrats der Entfernung wirkenden Anziehungs und Abstoßungskräfte*, Werke **5** (1867), 197–244.
- [14] A. A. Gonchar, E. A. Rakhmanov, *On convergence of simultaneous Padé approximants for systems of functions of Markov type*, Number theory, Mathematical analysis and Applications, Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov, Nauka, Moscow **157** (1981), 31–48 (in Russian); English transl. in: Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. **157**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (1983).
- [15] A. A. Gonchar, E. A. Rakhmanov, *Equilibrium measure and the distribution of zeros of extremal polynomials*, Mat. Sb. **125** (**167**) (1984), 117–127 (in Russian); English transl. in: Math. USSR-Sb. **53** (1986).

- [16] A. A. Gonchar, E. A. Rakhmanov, *On the equilibrium problem for vector potentials*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **40**:4 (1985), 155–156 (in Russian); English transl. in: Russian Math. Surveys **40**:4 (1985).
- [17] W. K. Hayman, P. B. Kennedy, *Subharmonic functions*, Academic Press, London (1976).
- [18] J. L. Kelley, *General topology*, Princeton, New York (1957).
- [19] N. S. Landkof, *Foundations of modern potential theory*, Nauka, Fizmatlit, Moscow (1966); English trans., Springer–Verlag, Berlin (1972).
- [20] F. Leja, *The theory of analytic functions*, Akad., Warsaw, 1957 (in Polish).
- [21] H. N. Mhaskar, E. B. Saff, *Extremal problems for polynomials with exponential weights*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **285** (1984), 204–234.
- [22] E. H. Moore, H. L. Smith, *A general theory of limits*, Amer. J. Math. **44** (1922), 102–121.
- [23] E. M. Nikishin, V. N. Sorokin, *Rational approximations and orthogonality*, Nauka, Fizmatlit, Moscow (1988); English trans., Translations of Mathematical Monographs **44**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (1991).
- [24] M. Ohtsuka, *On potentials in locally compact spaces*, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A-1 **25** (1961), 135–352.
- [25] E. B. Saff, V. Totik, *Logarithmic potentials with external fields*, Springer–Verlag, Berlin (1997).
- [26] N. Zorii, *A noncompact variational problem in the Riesz potential theory. I; II*, Ukrain. Math. Zh. **47** (1995), 1350–1360; **48** (1996), 603–613 (in Russian); English transl. in: Ukrain. Math. J. **47** (1995); **48** (1996).
- [27] N. Zorii, *On the solvability of the Gauss variational problem*, Comput. Meth. Funct. Theory **2** (2002), 427–448.
- [28] N. Zorii, *Equilibrium potentials with external fields*, Ukrain. Math. Zh. **55** (2003), 1178–1195 (in Russian); English transl. in: Ukrain. Math. J. **55** (2003).
- [29] N. Zorii, *Equilibrium problems for potentials with external fields*, Ukrain. Math. Zh. **55** (2003), 1315–1339 (in Russian); English transl. in: Ukrain. Math. J. **55** (2003).
- [30] N. Zorii, *Necessary and sufficient conditions of the solvability of the Gauss variational problem*, Oberwolfach Rep. **4** (2007) 1067–1070.